

Mr. Randolph A. Reese

6/1

Mr. Randolph A. Reese
 Special Programs Examiner
 Technology Center 3600

6-page facsimile
 +1 571 273 8300

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

SEP 28 2005

CC: Mr. John LeGuyader
 Executive Assistant
 Office of the Commissioner for Patent

Dr. -Ing. Giok Djien Go
 Pfahlgrabenstr. 45
 D-65510 Idstein
 Germany

phone/fax +49 6126 8949

Objections to your wrong decision (E29a)

E27	06/22/2005	Notice of Abandonment	
E28	07/22/2005	Letter of Petitions	Undersecretary Dudas
E29a	08/12/2005	Office of Petition	wrong decision
E29b	08/19/2005	John LeGuyader	

Dear Mr. Reese,

2005-09-28

Your decision (E29a) is wrong, inaccurate, improper and false because you have **not** read my objections A1 to A10 in pp.1 to 3 of the letter of petitions (E28), directed to Under Secretary Dudas. My objections are further substantiated by the following ones. Please read very carefully, precisely, objectively and meticulously all my objections A1 to A24 and the papers (E1) to (E28) in order to issue a proper decision.

A11) You failed to read a or the stiff third transport-system member, defined in three places

1. in the specification,
2. in Claim 42, written in (E8), and
3. in Claim 42, written in (E28).

The (E8), dated 10/24/2003, was written long before (E27) was mailed on 06/22/2005. Please comply with my above-mentioned request for reading of all my objections A1 to A24 and the papers (E1) to (E28).

A12) The correspondence over five years, terminated by the Notice of Abandonment, dated 06/22/2005 is irrefutable evidence for

1. timely filing of all my replies to the examiners' letters to USPTO,
2. incorrectness, inaccuracy, impropriety and wrongfulness of your decision and

Dr.-Ing. Giok Djien Go
 Pfahlgrabenstr. 45
 D-65510 Idstein
 Germany

Mr. Randolph A. Reese

6/2

3. having **not** read the case at all.

A13A) In (E29a) you created **your own rule**, "*unless the examiner holds the claims to be in condition for allowance*". In regard thereto and to (E9), the examiner has already held the claims, particularly the Claim 42 to be in condition for allowance because I have **already** rewritten or amended them to overcome the rejections found in (E15)!

1. Why have you **not** applied your own rule to the examiners Mrs. Draper, Mr. Culbreth and Mr. Dickson?
2. When will you apply it to them?

A13B) In regard with the application 10/690,742 and three OASs (Office Summary Actions), dated 06/23/2004, 02/25 and 04/26/2005, and the Advisory Action, the examiners Mrs. Draper and Mr. Dunn have given consent on the generalized definition of "*stiff transport-system members*". When will you apply your own rule to them?

A13C) In regard with the application 10/690,741 and the OAS, dated 06/17/2004, the examiner Mrs. Draper has given consent on the generalized definition of "*stiff transport-system members*".

When will you apply your own rule to them?

A14) In (E17) Mrs. Draper brought discredit to my reputation by alleging, "*The applicant has amended Claim 42 to include a stiff third transport-system member—the stiff description was not disclosed in the specification at the time the application (E8) was filed*". In short, she has classified me as a **swindler**! Please clarify the following cases:

1. Why do you, Mrs. Draper, Mr. Dickson and Mr. Culbreth have such difficulty to read the term "*stiff third transport-system member*", disclosed in the specification as well as in Claim 42 of (E8), all of which document Mrs. Draper's discrediting and lying?
2. Why have Mr. Dickson and Mr. Culbreth **supported** her in **lying** and **harming my reputation**?
3. Is the **goal** of Mrs. Draper, Mr. Dickson and Mr. Culbreth to bring discredit to my reputation by classifying me since June 16, 2004 as the **biggest swindler**?

Dr.-Ing. Glok Dijen Go
Pfehlgrabenstr. 45
D-65510 Idstein
Germany

Mr. Randolph A. Reese

6/3

4. Why did Mrs. Draper have **ill-feelings** towards me before leaving USPTO?
5. Why have you **not** detected Mrs. Draper's lying and discrediting, which **have** violated the patent rules of USPTO, despite "having read" all the papers (E1) to (E28)?
6. Why have they **lied** to Under Secretary Dudas and his predecessor since June 16, 2004?

Please note, you can't spend millions of dollars in gaining a good reputation when mine is tarnished by the examiners of USPTO. Therefore, you should inform Under Secretary Dudas thereof. Please read very carefully, precisely, objectively and meticulously all my objections A1 to A24 and the papers (E1) to (E28) in order to issue a proper decision.

A15) If you, Mrs. Draper, Mr. Dickson and Mr. Culbreth, acting as examiners of USPTO, are Mechanical Engineers with a **solid background** why do none of you know that the end portions of each seat belt are **not** attached to the floor of aeroplane, which all of you have been suggesting? Contrarily, the examiners of DPMA, EPO and CIPO (German, European and Canadian Patent Office), having **very solid background and excellent knowledge in Mechanical Engineering**, have granted patent thereon without wasting time for superfluous OASs (Office Summary Actions) and paper work from (E17) to (E29b). Please read CA 2,313,780, EP 1 037 773 B1 and DE 197 49 780 C2. Do you agree that persons having **poor background and lack of knowledge in Mechanical Engineering**, like some of my students, are **not** qualified to be examiners, particularly, supervisors at USPTO **at all**?

A16) Obviously, I have to explain to all of you why the end portions of seat belts are attached to the seat. All seats together with their seat belts have to be preassembled before delivering them to the manufacturing aircraft halls. When delivered, the preassembled seats are fastened to the floor of the aeroplane, thus saving time and costs. Please write me if you have seen the end portions of seat belts fastened to the aeroplane floor.

A17) Please contact John Hammerschmidt, Acting Chairman of NTSB, Jane F. Garvey, Acting Chairperson of FAA, David Hempe, FAA Manager, Gary Frings, FAA Manager and Thomas A. Boudreau, FAA Manager, all of whom are familiar with my restraint systems, one of which is

Dr.-Ing. Gök Dijen Go
Pfalzgrabenstr. 45
D-65510 Idstein
Germany

Mr. Randolph A. Reese

6/4

09/554,463, if you still have difficulties understanding 09/554,463 and my objections and ask Mr. Hammerschmidt why he has a far better knowledge than those examiners of USPTO?

A18) Why have Mrs. Draper, Mr. Dunn and Mr. Dickson cited the references, which are the **three** greatest examples of junk, five times (G2, G4, G6, G8, G11) just for a single application ref. to 10/690,742 "Anti-submarining seat-belt assembly". In contrary to them the examiners of DPMA, EPO and CIPO have cited references in only **one** examination report despite having examined a far larger number of applications. Why has Mr. Dickson, Supervisor, repeatedly cited Monages' US 5,524,928, **the** greatest piece of junk in the world, whose shortcomings D1 to D14, listed in (G7), I had to explain to Mr. Dunn? Furthermore, I gave him an oral and written explanation that EPO would never grant patent thereon! Had I not filed a letter of complaint to Under Secretary Dudas, Mr. Dunn and Mr. Dickson would **not** have granted patent thereon, but issued a Notice of Abandonment! Two OASs, one Advisory Action (G4, G6, G11) and my paper work were superfluous. Why could Mr. Dickson not prevent it? Why was he **unable** to discover by himself three pieces of junk, US 5,524,928, US 4,402,548 and US 5,257,854, serving as cited references? In contrary to him, the examiners and supervisors of DPMA, EPO and CIPO cited no junk!

A19) In their OAS, dated 09/30/2003 Mr Toan C. To and Mr. Dickson demanded subdivision of my 09/125,445 into **eleven** species (Have you ever read that new term for divisional appls in Oxford and Webster dictionaries?). When will they request me to subdivide it into **twenty seven** species because of **twenty seven** figures? Upon Mr To's request I filed arguments, some of which are listed herein:

- a) If the schematic Figs. 1 to 10, 13, 18, 19, 22 to 26, serving as information to the readers, are omitted, 09/125,445 has only nine figures relating to that feature, far less than the **twenty five** figures of US 5,806,917, to which the Primary Examiner Gary Hoge made no objection or demand to subdivide into **twenty five** species. Why has Mr. Dickson **not** issued a **Notice of abandonment**, substantiated by his request to subdivide it into **twenty five** species?

Dr.-Ing. Glok Dijlen Go
Pfahlgrabenstr. 45
D-05510 Idstein
Germany

Mr. Randolph A. Reese

6/5

- b) Not eleven species (independent Claims), but only two independent Claims (species) 1 and 2 I wrote in my amended appl. Doubtless, all three species 6, 9 and 10 are absolutely identical! Why have they issued a Notice of Abandonment?
- c) The main object of the invention is to provide for a motor-vehicle seat *at least one* energy absorber which withstands the intrusion of a vehicle door (side), deformed by impact force in a real-world side accident, absorbs it and transmits the rest into the vehicle floor, thus achieving work of deformation and friction associated with decreasing the impact energy and intrusion and thereby lowering injury severities. Logically, *only* the energy absorbers, which are definitely the *single* feature, are suited therefor and grouped into the species 1, 5 to 11 with the rotatable device and the species 2 to 4. Both are defined by two independent Claims 1 and 2. See Claims (footnote "EE-US 09/125,445-141103"), submitted to you on Nov. 17.
- d) Having the same opinion, the examiners of the European and Canadian Patent Office granted patent thereon and issued EP 0844939 B1 and CA 2,230,721, dated 2004/01/13. Please see the Claims of CA 2,230,721, which are the same as the Claims (footnote "EE-CA-141103-amended"), submitted to you on Nov. 17.
- e) The US-Patent Docs, some of which are listed in my registered letter of Nov. 17, have many species (embodiments), on which no examiners have imposed restriction.

Etc.

Despite failing to respond to the above-mentioned arguments and others, all of which are listed in my letter, they sent me a Notice of Abandonment. There is a need to file a letter of complaint to Under Secretary Dudas!

A22) Similarly, Mrs. Ruth Ilan and Mr. Dickson sent me a Notice of Abandonment regarding 09/101,838. Before going on vacation she assured me she was willing to amend the claims! There is a need to file a letter of complaint to Under Secretary Dudas!

A23) The above-mentioned examples document how Mr. Dickson has influenced his examiners and cooperated with them to terminate my patent appls. by issuing Notices of Abandonment. Have you any explanation why Mr. Dickson cited three greatest pieces of junk in the history of USPTO for a single patent application 10/690,742 and why Mr. Dunn

1. at first, granted patent thereon,
2. later on, withdrew it by citing together with Mr. Dickson the third greatest piece of junk and

Dr.-Ing. Glok Dijen Go
Pfahlgrobenstr. 45
D-65510 Idstein
Germany

Mr. Randolph A. Reese

6/6

3. finally, granted patent thereon, after I have filed a letter of complaint and petition to Under Secretary Dudas?

A24) Should we write a script "Granting patent, Withdrawal of Allowance and Granting patent again" for Hollywood and promote Mr. Dickson to a Hollywood Star in charge of

1. issuing Notices of Abandonment to all my patent appls, on all of which DPMA, EPO and/or CIPO have granted patent,
2. requesting the subdivision of a patent appl. into **eleven species** and?
3. one day ordering me to subdivide a patent appl. into **forty species** because of **40 figures**, as with EP 1 147 029 B1?


As a US Green-Card Holder and having worked for US Corps I am able to outline all my objections with the American way of thinking and fight off injustice in compliance with President Thomas Jefferson.

Please reply to **all my objections** from A1 to A24, that substantiate the incorrectness, inaccuracy, impropriety and wrongfulness of your decision (E29a), which has nothing to do with my petition (E28)!

Thank you for your attention and all your help in advance.

Kind regards

Dr. Go



Dr.-Ing. Glok Djen G.
Pfahlgrabenstr. 45
D-65510 Idstein
Germany